

VZCZCXRO2978  
RR RUEHCN RUEHGH RUEHVC  
DE RUEHBJ #1165/01 1200821  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
R 300821Z APR 09  
FM AMEMBASSY BEIJING  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 3734  
INFO RUEHOO/CHINA POSTS COLLECTIVE  
RHMFIUU/CDR USPACOM HONOLULU HI

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 BEIJING 001165

DEPARTMENT FOR INR/R/MR, EAP/CM, EAP/PA, EAP/PD, C  
HQ PACOM FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY ADVISOR (J007)  
SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [OPRC](#) [KMDR](#) [CH](#) [PREL](#) [ECON](#)

SUBJECT: MEDIA REACTION: U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS, OBAMA'S 100 DAYS

-----  
Editorial Quotes  
-----

1. U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS

"The U.S. conducts hundreds of special investigations on China every year"

The official Communist Party international news publication Global Times (Huanqiu Shibao)(04/30): These reports focus on the national security of the U.S. It is believed that the purpose of these reports is to create negative public opinions of China and intentionally destroy China's image. American experts argue that the criticism of China in their reports is inevitable, but the main aim is to criticize the U.S. Researcher Niu Xinchun from China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations says that there is a specific background and purpose for the critical reports issued by the U.S. government. Some are written to influence a Chinese economic or political policy or to put pressure on the Chinese government; such is the case for the Human Rights Report. Therefore, China needs to be clear about the real purpose behind the document before it responds. These reports are written by various think-tanks. Niu expressed that some of the reports about U.S.-China relations, written by the major organizations, are relatively objective. But some of the reports from small organizations tend to attract the media's attention so as to secure more funds or to speak for the group that they're supporting. On the one hand, it's not necessary to fuss about this kind of report. On the other hand, China should be aware that these reports may attract the attention of the public and could destroy China's image.

The reports are written by both anti China and pro China groups. A U.S. expert says that because the U.S. and China do not have sufficient mutual trust, there are still some concerns about China's influence on America's national security. But the purpose is just to describe the existence of the issues, not to prove the anti or pro China stances. China needs to learn to deal with different voices. Professor Zhang Lili from the Foreign Affairs University says that "because China wants to maintain the world's harmony, China is very reserved. The country does not want to interrupt other countries personal domestic affairs. And therefore it is unfair to China." Zhang thinks that it will be tough work for China to respond to these "voices" from various sources. It's impossible for the Chinese government to react to each of the voices. Different levels of Chinese organizations and civil groups should actively play their roles.

2. OBAMA'S FIRST 100 DAYS

a. "[Focus] Obama's first 100 days: the luxurious diplomatic dance is hard to change"

The Shanghai-based Shanghai Media Group (SMG) publication, China Business News (Diyi Caijing) (04/30): Obama's foreign policy starts to change direction and appears to be an obvious sign of "breaking

the deadlock" during his first 100 days. This attracted both domestic and international praise. Ma Tengsi, from the Centre for European Policy Studies, says that "When they laugh at Obama's solutions, Republicans always forget that the current problems were made during the Bush's Administration." Obama is very good at being diplomatic at the proper time. Obama's winning the presidential election has, to some extent, already restored the U.S.-Europe relations. But it should be noted that Obama's personal diplomatic charms do not equal U.S. foreign policies. There are still disputes between the two Parties and limitations to the current American global strategies. Observers say that Obama's all-star diplomatic team is showing conflicting signals. During the past 100 days, Secretary Hillary [Clinton] has been busy dealing with the issues in the Middle East. A Chinese anti-terrorist expert says that Hillary [Clinton] is still in the stage of a "fireman putting out a fire", which reflects the fact that the Obama's administration hasn't yet made a clear global strategy. Speaking from another perspective, although the U.S. has made strategic deployments, the real efficiency of their deployment has been reduced due to the decline of the strength of the U.S. Taking Hillary's [Clinton's criticism for the Pakistani government as an example, this former Senator, who chose to use 'smart power' for this stunt, has shown her limitations on understanding the regional issues at hand. But her words are in line with the strategies of the Obama administration; to "worsen" the situations in Afghanistan and Pakistan. This can help successfully move the public's attention from the worse Iraqi domestic situations to Obama's "Afghanistan-Pakistan integrated strategy".

b. "THE U.S. SHOULDN'T ALWAYS WANT TO LEAD THE WORLD"

The official Communist Party international news publication Global

BEIJING 00001165 002 OF 002

Times (Huanqiu Shibao)(04/30): No one really wants to challenge the dominant position of the U.S. What people would like to see is the U.S. accepting the diversified world. The most important thing is for the U.S. to really sit down and discuss the future development, with the diverse international community, instead of forcing change onto other countries according to the American ideas and model. There are some questions about the foreign policies of the U.S. First, can the U.S. truly understand the resentment it feels from other nations? The Obama administration still believes that the global military presence of the U.S. is a positive thing. Can he understand that this presence makes the locals feel uncomfortable and humiliated? Second, can "soft diplomacy" solve the "hard problems" of the future? If it fails, will Obama continue the cycle where by each U.S. President begins a war? And third, will the U.S. shift its burden onto other countries during this crisis? All these questions need time to be answered. Under the current multi-lateral world, we need a leader who is willing to respect others and bear the most responsibility, not a hegemonic nation who believes his leadership is a divine right.

c. "U.S. doesn't have the divine right to lead the world"

English-language daily published by the People's Daily Global Times English (04/30): To some extent, Obama's multilateralism simply means he is more pragmatic. Despite the fact that the U.S. still plays a leading role in the global economic and political arenas, its ability to deal with international issues has fallen short of its wishes. Its military might remains unmatched, but the misuse and abuse of its military power is becoming unbearable. Obama remains firm that the U.S. must lead the world. However, the president has come to realize that the legitimacy of such leadership stems from the example it sets for the world. It is not a divine right. The American people are now blessed with a super commander in chief - one who intends to practice the American ideals using a pragmatic approach. There will be a time when the U.S. doesn't have the strength to lead the world. Being an example, the U.S. should have the moral character to be tolerant. It should learn to respect another country's right to occasionally be an "example."

PICCUTA